



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ON NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,317	10/602,317 06/24/2003		Linda A. Riedle	RPS920030083US1	9074
47052	7590	01/06/2006		EXAMINER	
		ROUP LLP	PATEL, HETUL B		
PO BOX 51 PALO ALT		4303		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2186	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/602,317	RIEDLE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Hetul Patel	2186

	Hetul Patel	2186	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $03$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to the check either box (b) or to the check either box (c) or to the checked, check either box (d) or to the checked, ch	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	acalisa
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> </ol>			ccause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	•
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21 See attached Nation of Non Co	moliant Amendment	(DTOL -324)
<ul><li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li><li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ul>		impliant Amendment	(1 1 OL-024).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b)      will not be entered, or b)      will will not be entered, or b)      will not be entered.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-36</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	it before or on the date of filing a North day the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	Is to provide a I).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
13.  ☐ Other: See attached PTO-892 form for prior art details.			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to remark, Applicant requests the Examiner to cite a reference that provides a teaching or suggestion for the limitation "to create a backup partition and backup logical partitions to the backup partition" for which Examiner took Official Notice.

Examiner would like to respond to Applicant's remark by introducing Hu et al. (USPN: 2004/0078680) reference, which teaches about creating the backup partition and backing up all logical partitions in the backup partition (e.g. see paragraph [0048]). Examiner introducing here the Hu et al. reference just as evidence necessary to support the Examiner's conclusion of common knowledge (Official Notice) in the art in the previous Office Actions mailed on July 07, 2005 and October 17, 2005...

MATTHEW D. ANDERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER